

# THE BROAD AX

HEW TO THE LINE.

VOL. I.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, NOVEMBER 9, 1895.

No. 11.

## THE NEW DEMOCRACY.

Address delivered November 1st, 1895, by Julius F. Taylor.

I DESIRE on this occasion to present to you a few plain conclusions, founded upon facts and history, and tending to prove that there is a *New Democracy*, or rather, perhaps a new feature to the old Democracy.

A few years ago it would have been a novelty to see, or hear of a colored Democrat; and even now, in some communities, they are rare species. But my friends, there are thousands of them in the United States, and their number is increasing as intelligence and reason dawn upon the mind of the colored race. I therefore assert that the time has come for the colored people "to divide on party lines."

In time long past, the colored people were taught to believe, and many believe it yet, that the word Democrat meant everything that was opposed to the interest and welfare of the negro. The name was supposed to embody an inveterate hatred and dislike of all our people on account of their race and color. That it meant a desire to keep in perpetual slavery, the mind, body and soul, and that ever since the fortunes of war struck the manacles from the slaves, that the word Democrat meant the incarnation of oppression, outrage and wrong. Starting out with this wrong impression in the mind of the colored man, it perhaps is not to be wondered at, that he treats with disdain and fear the thought of his being a Democrat. This was his early impression, engrafted there by wily and dishonest politicians.

And we all know how lasting our first and earliest impressions are. But my friends the time has come when we must awaken from this nightmare of falsehood, and open our eyes to the true reality we find about us.

Let us now unfold the pages of history, and see if we have not been misled in our early impressions and later conclusions. First, let us see whether or not the Democrats or the people of the Southern States, were the first and only people who favored the establishment of the slavery of the black man in the United States. According to all accepted history, a Dutch vessel sailed up the James River in 1619, with a cargo of twenty colored people, who were sold as slaves to the planters of Virginia. This was just one year before the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock, and it was the first act of establishing slavery in the United States. But a very few years after, the institution of slavery, spread its clammy fingers over all the provinces of the New World. It is true, it never flourished to any great extent in the frigid New England colonies, but as we shall hereafter see, it was fully recognized and protected even by the Pilgrim Fathers, who them-

selves had sought a new land to enjoy freedom and independence.

New York and Pennsylvania, not only tolerated slavery, but it actually existed within their borders until long after the Revolutionary War.

All the slaves, during the early period of this century, were the product of the African slave trade; the slaves being brought by the shipload direct from Africa and the islands of the tropics. The New England settlers, being expert seamen, and avaricious sailors, engaged largely in the slave trade for the immense profit there was in the business; so thousands of these poor creatures were yearly landed in the Colonies by the shrewd Yankees, who afterward became the ranting abolitionists. It soon became apparent that slavery could not be made profitable to the owners, except in the milder portions of the country, owing to the nature of the Negroes and their long continued habitation of a tropical land. Hence, the institution gradually died out in the colder latitudes, and increased in the warmer or southern portions of the country. This result was in accordance with a natural law, and not the result of any difference or distinction between the white people of the northern and southern portions of the New World. In fact, the history of each, shows that the early settlers of Virginia and Massachusetts, of Georgia and Pennsylvania and of many of the others, were all from England, all of the same blood, the same education, the same religion, and they all received their law from the same source, viz., the common law of England. As time went by, the sturdy New Englander looked with a jealous eye upon the ease and comforts enjoyed by their Southern neighbors, and he naturally attributed the difference in their situations to the result of the advantage of having servants to do the hard labor, incident upon the establishment of civilization in a new continent. This feeling of envy grew, year by year, until it blossomed out in an active opposition of slavery, not upon any moral or benevolent grounds, but in a desire to check the wonderful growth and prosperity of their brethren in the South.

At the close of the war of the Revolution Congress submitted the question of the slave trade to a committee, a majority of whom were Northern men, and on the eight of August, 1787, they reported against any prohibition, thus legalizing the slave-trade forever.

The Constitutional Convention submitted this question again to the committee, composed of a majority of Southern men, who reported that the slave-trade should absolutely cease in the year, 1800, which was afterward extended to 1808, by the vote of Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut. I will say right here, that Thomas Jefferson, the father of Democracy, was the man who introduced the resolution and urged the abolition of the slave-trade, but was met with opposition from New York and New

England, on account of the great profit resulting to those states by its continuance. From 1626 to 1664, Queen Elizabeth, the Stuarts, and even the City of Amsterdam, were patrons and partners of slave vessels, advancing money for outfit and sharing in the returns. (See Bancroft's History, Vol. II, page 60.) Even William Penn, the great Quaker philanthropist, opposed the abolition of slavery in 1701. (Ibid page 218.)

In 1669, an agreement was entered into between England and Spain, whereby the English obtained the monopoly of importing the slaves from Africa to the West Indies and America; and in thirty years, one hundred and forty-four thousand slaves were brought to this country and sold. Queen Anne and her subjects receiving three-fourths of the profits, and Philip V, of Spain, one fourth; (Ib. page 390.)

The church and leading divines, also encouraged this cruel and inhuman business, on the ground that it brought the African heathen under the influence of Christianity, thus:—

"The slave ships speed from coast to coast, Fanned by the wings of the Holy Ghost."

Having shown you the origin, of the slave-trade and its connection with and support from the northern people of the United States, I will now, for a few minutes, speak upon the recognition of slavery, and the laws respecting the colored people, in the North and East, prior to the civil war. We have seen that our northern fathers were not only slave-owners, but slave-traders; and when it became evident that slavery could not be maintained with profit, they sold their slaves to the planters of the South, and turned abolitionists. Thousands of our race were thus shipped from the New England shores to pass their lives in perpetual bondage in the South.

From a rapid survey of the laws of New England, and other Northern States, I can only refer to a few of the many, that proves the race prejudice and injustice of the whites toward the blacks. No free colored man was permitted to vote in any of the Northern States before the civil war. Many of the leading men of the North, believed the negro an inferior creature. Mr. Lincoln himself, said on September 18th, 1858, "I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way, the social and political equality of the white and black races; I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to marrying with white people; and I will say in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality." This was the sentiment of the Northern people generally prior to 1860.

In Massachusetts, if an African or negro, not born there, and not in bondage, should tarry within the commonwealth for a longer term than two months, he was imprisoned at hard labor until the next session of court, and if found guilty, be whipped with ten stripes, and ordered out of the state within ten days, and if he went not, the same course to be repeated. (Law of Mass.; Vol. 1, 1788.)

If negroes were found abroad after nine o'clock at night, unless upon an errand for their masters, they were put in the house of correction and whipped. (Ancient Charters; chap. 16, p. 3.)

Any one finding a negro slave five miles from home without a written pass from the master, is authorized to take up the slave and whip him or her on the bare back, not exceeding twenty lashes, and shall have a reward of five shillings, and reasonable charges for returning them to their homes, to be recovered from the owner as any other debt. (Laws of New Jersey, 1784.)

It may be lawful for any master or mistress to punish his or her slave at their discretion, not excluding to life or limb.

(New York, 1730) By the law of New York, a white man was fined five pounds, and a colored man ten pounds for the same offence. In 1822, in New York and in Rhode Island, if any person concealed or assisted in the escape of a slave they were fined three hundred dollars and imprisoned; this was far more severe than the Fugitive Slave Law. In New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut, no colored men could be set free unless security was given for their maintenance, or upon the payment of twenty pounds annually.

In Rhode Island, in 1822, if any person brought into the state any slave with the intent that they may there become free, were fined three hundred dollars for each slave.

The courts of the New England States recognized slavery and protected it, even not many years ago. As time is passing, I will only quote two cases in point: The Supreme Court of Massachusetts, in 1819, says: "A bill of sale or other formal instrument, was not necessary to transfer the property of a slave which is a mere personal chattel, but might pass as other chattels by delivery." (16, Mass. Rep. 110 Tyng. Reps.) In 1816, the same court says: "At the time of his birth, Caesar was a slave, and as such was the property of his master, as much as his ox or his horse; he had no civil rights, but that of protection from cruelty; he could acquire no property, nor dispose of any without the consent of his master; his children of the issue of his marriage with a slave, would immediately upon their birth, become the property of his master, or the master of the female slave." (13 Mass. Reps. 547, Parker, Judge.)

Continued on page 2.